



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,890	02/13/2002	Peter John Crocker	IPL-2-PCT-US	2383

7590 07/14/2003

Ronald B Sherer
Bartlett & Sherer
103 South Shaffer Drive
New Freedom, PA 17349

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GHAFOORIAN, ROZ

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/049,890	CROCKER, PETER JOHN	
	Examiner Roz Ghafoorian	Art Unit 3763	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 52-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 55 and 60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 52-54 and 56-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claims 55, 60 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the applicant has introduced claims that read on spring as well as further holes along side of the needle such additions change the scope of the invention and require a new search and consideration.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 55, 60 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Specification

3. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3763

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 25-53, 56-57,59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No.5665071 to Wyrick.

Wyrick teaches an apparatus for injecting a substance into a surface which apparatus comprises a needle 26, a container 22 for substance to be injected, a means (50, 40) for applying the substance from the container to the tip of the needle 26, a means (50, 40, Col.6, lines 1-10) for driving the needle 26 to penetrate the surface and deliver the substance thereto which means comprise a block 32 slidably mounted to a conduit which block is accelerated by a controlled force to stick the needle 26 assembly thereby inducing an acceleration of the needle 26 to drive it into the surface. The block slidably mounted in a conduit so that application of a spring 44 at one end of the conduit will propel the block at speed down the conduit, so that it will strike an end piece, which forms part of, or is connected to the end of the needle.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 54 and 58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No.5665071 to Wyrick, and further in view of U.S Patent No.6402701 to Kaplan et al.

As mentioned above Wyrick teaches an apparatus for injecting a substance into a surface which apparatus comprises a needle 26, a container 22 for substance to be injected, a means (50, 40) for applying the substance from the container to the tip of the needle 26, a means (50, 40, Col.6, lines 1-10) for driving the needle 26 to penetrate the surface and deliver the substance thereto which means comprise a block 32 slidably mounted to a conduit which block is accelerated by a controlled force to stick the needle 26 assembly thereby inducing an acceleration of the needle 26 to drive it into the surface. The block slidably mounted in a conduit so that application of a spring 44 at one end of the conduit will propel the block at speed down the conduit, so that it will strike an end piece, which forms part of, or is connected to the end of the needle.

Wyrick however, does not teach a driving means which is pneumatically operated. Kaplan teaches a needle instrument which is pneumatically operated.

Therefore it would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invitation was made to have combined these two studies, because according to Kaplan a needle assembly which is pneumatically operated allows the care giver to select a predetermined depth and force of thrusts, (Col.3, lines 50-65) which decreases the pain associated with injections.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5-1-2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

Art Unit: 3763

relies (i.e., teach the needle being spaced form the "driver" so as to be impacted only after the driver has attained a high degree of velocity.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

- b. The applicant alleges Wyrick fails to teach the applicants invention because it fail to teach the needle being spaced form the "driver" so as to be impacted only after the driver has attained a high degree of velocity. Its not clear what the applicant is referring to when he mentions "driver" there is no such description in the specification or the claims. Therefore it's not clear what the applicant is arguing. The examiner has assumed the applicant is referring to the block when discussing the "driver". Although not claimed by the applicant, Wyrick does teach the block being separate from the needle.
- c. The applicant has failed to respond to the IDS objection made in paper NO.6, therefore the objection remains.

Conclusion

- 7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3763

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roz Ghafoorian whose telephone number is 703-305-2336. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

RG
July 9, 2003


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700